UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

How Many Prophets?

By ANGELA MORGAN

Ownership and Justice

By M. C. OTTO

Disobedience To Law
Is It Ever Justifiable?

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Future of India and World Peace

By TARAKNATH DAS

VOLUME CV NUMBER 11

Chicago, May 12, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission FOR FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Sidney Coltier, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Rossiter, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sutherland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

A Series of Nineteen Brief Essays

entitled

"PARABLES OF WAR AND PEACE"

by

John Haynes Holmes

Editor-in-Chief of Unity

These Parables have been written by Mr. Holmes at odd times since the close of the Great War. They are meant to represent in symbolic or narrative form the basic truths of the absurdity and horror of war and of the blessing of peace. Each Parable deals imaginatively with one specific aspect of the subject.

This special series will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for April 7.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 163
Ownership and Justice—M. C. OTTO 165
Jottings—J. H. H. 167

ARTICLES—

Parables of War and Peace—VI. Boundaries —JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 167
Disobedience to Law—Is It Ever Justifiable? —JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 168
Future of India and World Peace—TARAKNATH DAS 171

POETRY—

How Many Prophets?—*Angela Morgan* 163
Tom Mooney—LILITH LORRAINE 172

THE STUDY TABLE—

Gandhi's Ideas—W. W. W. ARGOW 173
In Defense of Democracy—CURTIS W. REESE. 173
War Resistance—H. 174

THE FIELD—

Report of the Social Service Committee to the New York East Conference, 1930 175

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CV | MONDAY, MAY 12, 1930 | NUMBER 11

HOW MANY PROPHETS?

How many prophets would ye have, O people?
How many saviors of a martyr-killing race?
How many prophets would ye stone and imprison,
O cruel and blind generation!
Ye have had Socrates,
Ye have had Lincoln,
Ye have had Tolstoy, Buddha,
Gandhi.

Many there be who do pray for a star.
Many in this darkest night of the world
Grovel at the feet of the Most High God,
Begging for a Savior or a Sign . . .
Yet here is Gandhi!
Take him to your hearts, O people,
For lo, a messenger whose word shall make you whole,
Take him for your nourishing, O nations,
For here is the bread that shall cure your famines.
Take him into your courts, O lawgivers,
For here is the Law that fulfilleth all law.

Take him into your council chambers,
O diplomats and statesmen,
Who with cold words engraven upon parchment
Have fashioned future hells for the weak and the dependent!
Receive him into your congresses and parliaments,
Ye who are spokesmen for those who may not speak;
Link him unto your governments, O rulers in high places,
Premiers, presidents, mayors, kings!

Take him into your churches,
O hymn-singing, enraptured congregations,
Bending the knee to a Janus God breathing Love and War.
Take him into your pulpits, ministers of the gospel
Who make many prayers and are forever mouthing
The sacred word of God,
Yet know not that word when it doth come!

Turn and look upon him, murderers!
Ye who make of the blossoming earth
A graveyard of young men's bones . . .
Warlords, profiteers, vendors of infamy;
Makers of machine guns, army tanks, battleships,
Bombing airplanes and poisoned gas.
O ye who make a mock of children's bodies
Trampled under the unheeding hoofs of War;
Ye who make mock of stricken women
Mourning for those who shall never return;
Ye who would pile dead upon dead, war upon war,
Infamy upon infamy . . .
Turn ye, and look upon this man!

How many prophets would ye have, O people?
How many Christs from Pilate for the rabble?
Still do ye plead for a Sign and a Token?
Do ye kneel still?
Yet here is Gandhi!

Angela Morgan, in "Creator Man." (Permission Dodd, Mead & Company)

Nothing is more significant of the situation in India than the change in Gandhi. At bottom, the Mahatma is the same man that he has been ever since the early days in South Africa—the patient and heroic exemplar of non-resistant methods in the liberation of his people. But in his present campaign—perhaps his last—there is a certain extremity of effort, an utter consistency of dedication, which has not been seen before. Thus, in his great campaign of 1920-1921, Gandhi interpreted his objective, *Swaraj,* to mean a degree of freedom falling considerably short of national independence—at the most, dominion status within the Empire. Today, he is committed to nothing less than independence. A decade ago, the Mahatma placed non-payment of taxes as the last item on his program of non-violent non-cooperation. Now he pledges non-payment of taxes as the first item, thus beginning where formerly he left off. Most significant of all, he is refusing in this campaign to be delayed or deterred by outbreaks of violence. In his earlier movement, he halted the progress of his cause whenever it was marred by violence, and in his speech to the judge at his great trial in 1922, assumed personal and penitential responsibility for all that had occurred. But today he refuses to be turned aside even by that which he most fears and hates. If violence comes, it is the English who are to blame for resisting by force a righteous endeavor of a great people after liberty. Furthermore, it is violence which brings suffering in its train, and it is by suffering and dying that salvation may alone be won. Here is a new Gandhi—a more determined Gandhi, a more relentless Gandhi. By every device within his power, he has sought to avoid this final duel between India and India's oppressors. But now the final hour has struck, and the Mahatma and his people must go through with their enormous task with unfaltering love, but with unfaltering determination as well. This is "the terrible meek" at work again —the "meek" who "inherit the earth!"

The recent action of the Independent Labor Party in repudiating Premier MacDonald and his leadership of the British Labor Party is not surprising. It was some months ago that Mr. MacDonald announced his resignation from the I. L. P., a fact which clearly indicated trouble. Now the break becomes political as well as personal between an extreme left wing group and that larger body of the Labor Party as a whole

which, of course, tends to conservatism just in proportion as it assumes responsibility and wields power. The situation has much of the tragic in it. Thus, the Independent Labor Party represents the seed from which has sprung the great party of trades unionists, co-operators and Socialists who today rule the British realm. This small group of radicals served during more than a generation as the pioneers who blazed the trail which has led at last to the astounding triumph of a labor government in England. But the Independent Labor Party is not merely a band of veteran warriors in an heroic cause. It is also the rallying center of the younger, more militant spirits who flame with the eager hope of "Socialism in our time." The radicalism —i. e., the uncompromising idealism—of British Labor is in this group, and it looks upon government which bears its name and exacts its allegiance and yet can scarcely be distinguished from the courageous Liberalism of Asquith and Lloyd George before the War. In foreign affairs Mr. MacDonald has the support of the Tories, because he does what they would do; in domestic affairs, he has the support of the Liberals, for the same reason. Thus he holds office in a house in which his own party constitutes a minority. Where is there any satisfaction for radicals in such statesmanship? These radicals want a capital levy at home, and a free India abroad. MacDonald says "Nay"—and the radicals revolt! It is all very tragic as MacDonald is sincerely trying to adapt principle to policy. But can it be done?

The *New Republic* (issue of April 30) has published a list of recent Communist cases in United States courts, with a statement of the treatment meted out in each case to the defendants. In California five young women are in prison for displaying a red flag in a children's summer camp, one from one to ten years and the other four from six months to five years. In Buffalo two men are in jail for 100 days each because they were caught decorating a hall with "work or wages" signs. Two men are serving four months' sentences in Waterbury, Connecticut, for carrying slogan-placards at a public demonstration. In Pennsylvania three Communists, arrested in a private home and convicted on the evidence of literature found in their pockets, are beginning to serve five-year sentences. In Ohio two girls have been given sentences, one from five to ten years, the other from one to ten years, for the heinous crime of distributing literature deemed to be seditious. In Massachusetts Harry Canter has just been released after serving a one-year sentence for calling Governor Fuller the murderer of Sacco and Vanzetti. In North Carolina George Saul, arrested for addressing an open-air meeting, is doing six months on the chain-gang. In New York City four Communists, arrested at the March 6 demonstration in Union Square, have recently been "sent up" for indeterminate sentences up to three years. "These are only a few of the many recent occurrences," says the *New Republic*. And these cases, let us emphasize, are taken not from the criminal history of Tsarist Russia, but from the story of what is going on right now in "free" America. We are not a Communist, but if anything could make us a Communist, it would be deeds like these.

The squawking of the "wet" hen is getting louder and louder. There is only one reason why a hen ever squawks, and that is that the ugly bird is being roughly handled and sees that its end is near. Steadily, like the ponderous procession of a glacier, the Prohibition cause moves on. Within recent months Mr. Wickersham, Chairman of the President's Law Enforcement Commission, and Mr. Mitchell, Atttorney-General of the United States, the two men who ought to know more about the fact than any other two men in the country, have both testified that enforcement of the liquor laws is constantly improving. Within these same months the Canadian Government has been taking the last steps in passing legislation closing the border on the Canadian side against exportations of alcoholic beverages into the United States. Within the last month the Supreme Court has announced a decision making perfectly constitutional and legal the waiving of jury trials in liquor cases which the "wets" have been furiously describing as the latest form of tyranny. What is becoming more and more apparent is the utter futility of the "wet" campaign against the law. It is the discovery of this futility—the failure of all their proposed legislation, the collapse of all their appeals to the courts, the dissipation of all their reliance upon foreign nations—which has driven the "wets" to their last resort of propaganda. What they now hope to do is to break down the morale of the American people, as this morale was broken down, for example, in the days preceding our entrance into the Great War. It took three years to demoralize the peace sentiment of the people, so that they were ready to take up arms against Germany in 1917. The "wets" are willing to keep on their unscrupulous agitation for three years, and twice three years, if they can at last discourage and destroy the "dry" sentiment of the country. And they may succeed! What we see now is a race between a slowly but surely tightening process of Prohibition enforcement and a deliberate attempt to debauch the public mind by propaganda. "No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God."

We don't imagine that Premier MacDonald will consult this paper before he appoints the successor to Robert Bridges, the late Poet Laureate of England. But we like to amuse ourselves, all the same, by con-

sidering the possibilities in the situation, the more as we are delightfully free of all responsibility. The candidate who comes almost inevitably first to mind is RUDYARD KIPLING, but when this distinguished poet lost the appointment to Alfred Austin, years ago, he probably lost it forever. If the author of "Recessional" was too imperialistic and war-like then, he certainly is the same now. Whatever Kipling's merits or claims, it is quite impossible to imagine MacDonald selecting the bard of English militarism for this high office. The same fact applies, in somewhat lesser degree, to HENRY NEWBOLT, singer of incomparable songs and ballads, but all in celebration of England's navy and its prowess on the sea. W. W. GIBSON knows the people and landscape of England, but his genius is peculiarly individualistic. It is difficult to conceive of his taking his shy muse out into the noise of large affairs. This is true also of HOUSMAN—the "Shropshire lad" is no poet to a king! W. H. DAVIES and ROBERT GRAVES are both true poets, but they do not seem large enough for the Laureateship. If the Bridges tradition is to be followed, perhaps GORDON BOTTOMLEY should be the choice. But in the end three men stand out in our mind as marked claimants for this honor. First, JOHN MASEFIELD—one of England's greatest poets, not now doing his greatest work, never a singer of public events, and yet by his sheer genius a candidate to be reverenced. Next, ALFRED NOYES, whose "Drake" and "The Torch-bearers" show his mastery of the noble and lofty line, and a poet whose muse has done valiant service in the cause of peace and brotherhood among the nations. Lastly, GILBERT K. CHESTERTON, a greater poet and a purer spirit than his own brilliant but empty prose has ever permitted us to know. Nor is this the end, for we have still to name the man whom we would choose, though he seems not to be mentioned at this hour. We refer to WILLIAM WATSON, a great poet in the truest tradition of English letters, and a man whose writings have already done exalted unofficial service as the nation's laureate.

There are certain things which make us tired—tired to the point of exhaustion and disgust. One of these things we are noticing just now as the new athletic season is beginning—namely, the poses in newspaper photographs. These poses are always the same—stereotyped to a point that makes wellnigh impossible the differentiation of individuals. The picture of a swimmer, for example, invariably shows a young man or woman stooping forward in the awkward crouch that is said to precede the leap into the water. The picture of a golfer shows an individual with his club lifted far back over his shoulder, at the end of the swing. The picture of a baseball player may have two poses—either striking at the ball at the plate, or leaping with arm fully extended for the ball in the field. The picture of a track champion, as of a foot-ball warrior, always shows the athlete hugging the ground in preparation for his dash. Have newspaper photographers no imagination that they always keep to these stereotypes? Are newspaper readers like nursery children that they must always see the same picture? Or is it that the general public are such morons that they could not recognize a swimmer if he stood erect with folded arms, or a golf-player if he rested gracefully on his club as on a cane? Our own feeling is that we have here one more illustration of the increasing standardization of our lives. Everything is done by everybody in precisely the same way. We must dress alike, walk alike, pose alike—go to the same places, see the same shows, do the same things. The rotogravure sections of our newspapers are the perfect demonstration of what we mean. Week *after week after week* they present the same pictures of incidentally the same people! And we wonder that America is producing no great artists! How can we produce great artists when imagination among us is dead?

Ownership and Justice

Some things in this world are hard to figure out. In California, for instance, two men are in prison, one of whom narrowly escaped hanging, and these two men—according to the judge before whom they were tried, the jury which served in the case, the important police officers who gathered the evidence on which they were convicted, the attorney general of the state, a federal commission appointed to investigate the trial—were not proved guilty of the crime with which they were charged. And yet the great state of California keeps them behind prison bars and may keep them there until they are freed by death.

Now if we could suppose that the people of California were brutal people, without human feeling or a sense of justice, the situation would not be puzzling. But the people of California are average mortals like the rest of us. They want to do the right thing. They would not deliberately keep any of their fellows, whom they believed innocent of crime, locked in prison. Speaking generally, they would not even keep persons in prison who had not been proven guilty. For in California, as elsewhere in our country, a man is regarded as legally innocent unless proven guilty.

Why, then, are Mooney and Billings in prison?

It is easy to reply that a conscienceless prosecuting attorney and a soulless industrial group back of him railroaded these two unfortunates to prison and have successfully thwarted all efforts to set them free. It

is easy to say this, relatively easy to believe it, but the explanation is too simple. If the people of California, if even a considerable portion of the people of California, if the business men or the laboring class or the church people, had taken a real interest in freedom for Mooney and Billings, they would long ago have been set at liberty. It is the great rank and file of the people of California—people who want to be just and who want to do right—who have kept these men in prison, men who, as far as can be made out, are innocent of the crime charged against them.

How shall we explain this? How shall we account for the fact that the people of California are comfortable in the face of this great wrong, which goes on accumulating injustice year after year?

It is not so easy to arrive at a satisfactory answer. California is a long distance off; the case is complex; our sympathies, one way or the other, interfere with a fair examination into the case. Nevertheless we may hazard a guess. The people of California refuse to look the problem in the face. But that only pushes things a step farther back. Why do they refuse to look the problem in the face? It may be worth while to consider this question a moment, since by doing so we who live in other portions of the United States become one with our fellow countrymen in California.

It is customary to assume that ours is an age of skepticism, a time when nothing is protected from the disintegrating effect of disbelief. And in a deep sense this is true. We not only freely challenge concepts and customs which our fathers thought unshakably established, but many of us are confessedly skeptical of the very possibility of believing in belief. And that is about as far as skepticism can go. In another realm, however, we are not skeptical at all. We believe with energy and enthusiasm. There we live by faith and not by sight. That realm is the realm of possessions. In that realm we do not ourselves question nor grant any one else the privilege of questioning. However we may feel about ideas or social habits, there is no doubt whatever how we feel about the things we own. The mere suggestion of a change in the economic status quo, upon which the security of what we own is thought to rest, makes us uneasy; and any attempt actually to bring about a change arouses all our fighting powers, good and bad.

Does not the fact of this allegiance supply a clue to the puzzle? Californians are committed to a form of society in which people accept the acquisition and ownership of things as the ultimate principle of living. They have other aims as well, but aims not bound up with this one are secondary. A particular thing may lose its attractiveness, indeed, is expected to do so, but the act or experience of getting and possessing, this does not and is not expected to lose its attractiveness. So prominent is this motive that all others are thrown into shadow. And, of course, that has consequences. When a person adopts certain interests he must necessarily expose others and surrender still others. If he puts high value upon possessions, he inevitably becomes anxious for the continuance of the social arrangements upon which the secure enjoyment of possessions seems to depend, and he inevitably grows insensitive to the losses which are entailed for himself and others. The more he is habituated to the predominance of this central interest, the more will his thinking and feeling be determined by the commitment, and the less will he be touched in mind or heart by facts or values which, if appreciated, would disturb his basic alignment.

There is thus nothing strange in a situation which on the face of it seems inexplicable. People of good impulses who would shudder and cry out if they witnessed physical torture practiced on a dog, or even on a grasshopper, go calmly about enjoying the air, the sunshine, the satisfactions of life, indifferent whether fellow mortals like Mooney and Billings are suffering the torture of years in prison for a crime they did not commit. Intellectually and emotionally bound to the prevailing economic order by virtue of their acquisitive philosophy of life, and satisfied that Mooney and Billings are enemies of this economic order, they are feelingless and blind, not only where the interests of these men are concerned, but wherever interests are at issue devotion to which would put the social status quo in jeopardy. And being the kind of people they are, that is, being compelled to regard the objects of their devotion as moral, whatever they are opposed to takes on the character of being bad. This not only justifies their indifference, but arouses them to righteous indignation. So people who love justice in the abstract, betray it in the concrete, and are completely unaware of their moral degradation.

Of course, this attitude is not limited to California. The guilt is national, though greater in some states than in others. The will to own is our most popular vice, and many are the sacrifices we make to it. Granted that without the experience of ownership the highest form of human life is impossible, it is equally true that where ownership becomes the ruling motive something fine is sacrificed, something of vision, of sympathy, of moral sensibility. Undoubtedly, many people in our country do not own enough to make possible the realization of their potentialities, no doubt many own too much, but it is not what, but how, things are owned which makes the difference. In the case of most of us, life would be lifted to a higher level if we had the courage to renounce the ideal of possessing. We could live richer, happier, more significant lives, and attain to a personal integrity now out of the question, if we could realize that Jesus spoke the literal truth when he said that anything we exchange for our better possibilities is a bad bargain. And among these better possibilities is the sense of

social justice, the ability to respond with sympathy and courage when our fellows are made to suffer because their ideals run counter to conventional practice and have the manhood or the womaanhood to stand by them.

Mooney and Billings are putting us once more to the test. If the question of their guilt or innocence remains a matter of indifference to us in spite of the accumulating evidence that they were never fairly tried, we may nevertheless continue to grow in power as a nation, but we will be devoid of moral greatness as a people. M. C. Otto.

Jottings

The cook seldom eats the food he cooks; the president of the New York Interborough Railroad does not ride in the subway; Will Hays, we must assume, never goes to the movies. If we really want to clean up the movie situation, make the man who controls the pictures see them!

The proletarian poet laureate of Russia has killed himself because of unrequited love. Human nature still seems to be the same the world around, even in the land of the Soviets!

The *Christian Science Monitor* announces a series of twenty article on "The Why of Prohibition." Don't miss these articles! The *Monitor* is "dry," but not fanatical; its policy is to find and tell the truth. It is one of the few newspapers in this country which can be trusted on this question.

D. A. R.—We have discovered at last what these mystic letters mean. "Deliriously Amusing Reactionaries."

We fail to see why everybody should get so excited over the Ohio prison holocaust. Burning convicts to death is nothing new. We do it all the time. Only we usually take them one by one, instead of three hundred in a batch, and burn them in an electric chair instead of in a stone cell. But it's the same thing! Or, if there is any difference, it is in favor of the Ohio horror. For the men burned wholesale in the cells were burned by accident, whereas, men burned retail in the chair are burned deliberately and intentionally.

"I don't jeer at reformers. He who lessens by one jot the pain and injustice of life is the highest of us all." Ludwig Lewisohn.—Amen, and Amen!

J. H. H.

Parables of War and Peace

VI.

Boundaries

The wars of men are as two brothers who dwelt side by side on pleasant farming lands. Pasture smiled on pasture, field on field; and daily the brothers clasped hands in common labor, and nightly joined hearts in song or story. Only there was between them and their acres a flowing river, sweet with cool, clear water, quiet as evening when stars were hidden in its depths, crossed by a bridge worn smooth by happy feet.

Now, on a day, in a far-distant city of the realm, it chanced that kings sat down in council. They talked of boundaries and frontiers, of alliances, of treaties signed and sworn. They looked at maps, which showed black circles for cities, curious wavy lines for rivers, and nothing at all for the smiling farms and homes of men. They laughed, these kings, and scowled, and laughed again. At last one took a stately quill, deep dipped in blood-red ink, drew on the map a single blood-red line, and said, "This line shall be the boundary." And the single blood-red line, and one curious wavy line which was a river, were the same!

There followed weeks and months; seed-time, harvest, and the winter snows! Gladly the brothers hailed the morn as they went forth to plow, or sow, or ingather the teeming harvest. Gratefully they blessed the night when work was done, and gratefully received its boon of sleep. Fat acres, heavy orchards, the cattle on the hills, the horse in stall, dogs, and the laughter of merry children—these were their rewards. Only there was between them and their homes the river, now turgid with mud and slime, rough as though disturbed by northern winds, yet spanned still by the bridge, grown old, unmended, and trembling to the step.

Then on a day, came tumult and confusion. Heralds of the king ran breathless through city streets and country lanes, sounding the alarm of war. Drums rolled their thunder, banners were lifted to flaunt their beauty in the sky, trumpets sang from brazen throats the music of clashing arms. And everywhere men dropped their plows, seized sword or musket, and sped away to answer to the king's command, while women wept and uncomprehending children shouted or were still. And one brother was summoned eastward, and the other westward from the river, which now was black and terrible as night, wild as some great cataract after storm, and glutted by the timbers of a broken bridge.

Again there followed weeks and months; drilling, marching and the shock of battle. And on a day, over hills unblessed by lowing herds of kine, and fields

where ploughshares rusted in the hard-baked soil, there came an army to a river's bank. Across the ugly stream, the enemy was camped, and soldiers dragging timbers from the boiling flood, were building high a bridge. Quick to the conflict rushed the hostile hosts; and fought till night hid foe from eager foe. Only were left two men who would not cease, so hot they were, and matched in skill and mettle each to each. On swaying beams they battled, weary, bleeding, sick. Muskets were emptied and cast away; sword was smitten against sword, and broken. They clutched with naked hands, swayed back and forth as trees, and at last plunged with a great cry into the stream. And all the night was still, and all the skies thick-sown with quiet stars.

Now in the morning, when the cloud of battle was rolling far away, a woman walked among the dead beside the river, and found two men, clasped in each other's arms as brothers laid in sleep. Only between them flowed a stream of water, blood-red as some thin line upon a map.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Disobedience to Law—Is It Ever Justifiable?

The presumption in our question is all against an affirmative reply. Other things being equal there are at least two reasons among many others why every citizen should be scrupulous in his obedience to the law.

In the first place, the law is the living tissue which constitutes the organism of society. From another point of view it may be described as the framework, or skeleton, which gives form and stability to the structure of the state. It is the pattern by which we live—the attraction of cell to cell, of individual to individual which holds us together as a social entity, as gravitation holds together the system of the stars.

If there is any one thing which enables a man to be something more than a mere wild creature of the jungle, living as the lion lives by devouring his prey, or as the savage lives by attacking and plundering his neighbor, it is his conscious recognition of the fact, already implicit in the herd instincts of gregarious animals, that if he is to live with his fellows it must be on some basis of habit or rule of doing things together with a common will and to a common end. This established habit or rule is what we call the law. This law may be nothing more than the custom of the tribe. It may be only certain traditional conventions established by long usage through generations gone by. It may be the will of a personal ruler, political or ecclesiastical, a king on the one hand or a priest on the other. It may be the common will of the people expressed through constitutional methods of popular legislation. In any case it is a standard which all recognize as the common way of life in which we may walk safely together. For association, or fellowship, the living together in society for mutual security and happiness, involves individual sacrifice, the subordination of personal whims, desires and ambitions to the common interest of the common whole. When our forefathers in 1787, in "the critical period of American history," found their colonial society suddenly falling into a condition of anarchy, they called a constitutional convention for the organization of a single state in which all the several colonies might live together. As a primary condition of this achievement they found that each one of the thirteen colonies must subordinate its own independent sovereignty to the supreme sovereignty of the new society, the United States of America. What was here true of each separate social sovereignty in the new United States, is true of each separate personal sovereignty in the community at large. Each must sacrifice something of himself to the common good. If I want to live my own life without let or hindrance from others, I should be free to go apart. "I see no *a priori* duty," says Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, "to live with others." But if I want to live with others, I must be willing to become a part of the common whole, and do not as I may want to do at any one time or under any given set of conditions, but only as I am allowed to do under the circumstances imposed by the society to which I belong. "If I live with others," says Justice Holmes again, "they tell me that I must do and abstain from doing various things or they will put the screws on to me. I believe that they will, and being of the same mind as to their conduct I not only accept the rules, but come in time to accept them with sympathy and emotional affirmation."

Obedience to law may not unfairly be described as acceptance of the social compact. It is the agreement to recognize the common will in return for the reward of the common life. The man who wilfully and knowingly disobeys the law is a poor sport; he refuses to play the game. The man who wilfully and knowingly disobeys the law is a parasite; he seeks to get everything and give nothing, to enjoy the privileges of society and deny its obligations. The man who wilfully and knowingly disobeys the law is an anarchist; for the satisfaction of his own personal habits or desires he is willing to destroy whatever portion of the social organization may stand in the way of this satisfaction. Penologists describe a criminal as an unsocial animal. The same description may be offered of any man who disobeys the law. He is unsocial, a poor comrade, and, therefore, unfit to live in fellowship with other men.

There is a second reason why the primary presumption is all against an affirmative reply to the question as to whether we may disobey the law. This reason applies very particularly to our own age and generation. I refer to the fact that modern society is intricately complex in its organization, and thus requires the exacting discipline of the individual as a condition of its survival. In the old days it was possible to have more or less going and coming on the basis of unhindered personal freedom and initiative. In a certain article on health laws, Miss Jane Addams has remarked that the housewife, living on the open prairie, was free to throw her garbage out of the back window into the back-yard, where it was innocently disposed of by the cleansing influences of sun and rain. But the daughter of this prairie mother, Miss Addams points out, now lives in the slums of

Chicago in the company of thousands of other people, and it is not safe for her to throw her garbage into her back-yard, or even into the gutter. In the interests of public health, the city prohibits such action. In the old days when there was plenty of room in our towns and cities, and one house was far separated from another, it was possible for us to build our homes as we wanted to build them—of material that we ourselves liked or found economical, and from plans that satisfied our individual whims and fancies. In New York City today, however, we are not allowed to build our homes in our own way. If I want to erect a structure I must first go to the building department and accept the conditions imposed by government. I must use certain prescribed materials, follow certain approved plans, yield obedience to certain universal standards. This means the crushing out of individuality in the places where we live, but not otherwise can we live at all in a crowded community where one house is built wall to wall with the next house. Years ago when we drove horses and buggies on the street, it was entirely possible to move anywhere one wanted to move, in any direction or at any speed. Today, with our highways crowded with powerful automobiles, we move under the direction of traffic laws which are more severe and peremptory in their operation than any laws of which history has any knowledge in a democracy. Hundreds of things are prohibited by our traffic laws, but nobody complains, for only upon the basis of these laws can the wheel of any automobile turn at all.

It is the slowness of human nature to adapt itself to the increasing complexities of modern life which explains fundamentally that lawlessness which is one of the chief social problems of our day. There are two factors in this problem. On the one hand is human nature, trained in this country for more than three centuries to the free and easy ways of a pioneer existence. On the other hand is society, which in the last generation has been changing with a swiftness unprecedented in the experience of man. In the space of my own lifetime I have seen society transformed more rapidly and completely, in all the infinite details of its life, than in the scores of centuries which have passed since the day of Moses to the present hour. Now human nature moves slowly. While society is undergoing these amazing metamorphoses, human nature remains the same stubborn thing it has been from the beginning of the world. Instinctively the individual revolts against the increasing rigor and complexity of civilization, against the infinitely tangled mechanisms of our modern communities. Hence lawlessness on every hand, lawlessness such as has never been known before! But there is no outcome of this situation except that of conformity to the inevitable. Individual discipline is the price today of social survival.

Presumption, therefore, is all in favor of obedience to law. Yet there never was a rule to which there was not an exception! Never any established law which did not have its reservations and denials! Therefore must we concede that there may be times and occasions when the higher interests of society, as contrasted with its routine efficiencies, may dictate disobedience to that very law by which society is itself sustained. Society, in other words, may under certain conditions not be worth sustaining. It may be better to return to the savage conditions of primitive existence than to live under civilized conditions so intolerable that life is intolerable under a continuance of these conditions. In the last analysis life remains paramount in this as in every other situation. "The Sabbath was made for man," said Jesus, in one of the wisest words that ever fell from his lips, "not man for the Sabbath." If life is not worth living under certain laws or conditions, then we must rebel against them as a sheer matter of self-respect. If life is being crushed out and destroyed by a weight of oppression imposed upon it, then we must rise up and destroy this oppression for the sake of our own spiritual survival. We can sum it all by saying that it is possible for the advantages of society to be bought at too high a price.

There are three conditions, as I see it, under which it is right and proper for men to disobey the law.

(1) It is right and proper to disobey the law when the law is a despotic law imposed upon the people by an alien ruler, in defiance of their will and in denial of their liberty. The American Revolution is the most familiar and impressive example of what I mean. Here on this Atlantic seaboard, a century and a half ago, were three million people trained in the traditions of English and Dutch democracy. Suddenly they found themselves living under the rule of an alien government in the person and under the will of King George III. This sovereign undertook to rule the destinies of his thirteen American colonies without consulting the people and thus in repression of their liberties. When the purpose of the king became clearly manifest, the people revolted. They refused to pay the Stamp Tax; they refused to obey the Navigation Acts. They even refused to recognize the authority of the king. This precipitated the Revolution which led to the establishment of our free and independent Republic.

An example in our own time is seen in the present situation in India. There is great difference between the people of India today and the people of the American colonies in 1775. But the political situation is identical. The Indians in our time, like our forefathers in their time, have found themselves living under the rule of an alien government, the law of which is despotic and thus oppressive. Passionately desirous of freedom, they are moving today toward open revolt; and the method of this revolt, under the inspired leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, is an organized refusal to obey the law of the English *Raj*. Gandhi's policy is that of non-violent non-cooperation, which means a denial of cooperation with the English rulers in terms of disobedience of the laws, statutes and edicts of their administration.

(2) Secondly, it is right and proper to disobey the law when the law in turn violates some higher law of ethics or religion, and thus forces men to do things which they regard as wicked or immoral. The outstanding illustration of this principle in our history is that of the Fugitive Slave Law. This law armed the United States government with the power to pursue fugitive slaves into free states, to seize their persons, and by due process of law to return them into serfdom. It also empowered federal officials charged with the enforcement of this law to exact the assistance of citizens in the free states in the business of seizing and returning escaped Negroes into slavery. It also forbade all such citizens to give aid and shelter to

any fugitive. On the Sunday following the enactment of this law Theodore Parker, the great American preacher, arose in his pulpit in the Boston Music Hall, and, after reading the terms of the law to his congregation, solemnly announced that he would not obey them. "For refusal to obey this law," said Parker, "I am fined $1,000 and made liable in damages for another $1,000, and subject to six months' imprisonment. Shall this view of the case terrify us into submission or arouse us to action? For myself, I say it solemnly, I will act with any body of serious and decent men as the head or the foot or the hand, in any movement not involving the use of deadly weapons, to nullify and defeat the operations of this law; and I feel confident there is enough manhood and true Christianity in Boston to protect every fugitive among us."

An illustration of this same principle in more recent times was seen in the case of the Conscription Act which was passed during the period of the Great War. When this act went into effect and millions were drafted for war service in Europe, 3,989 young men refused to obey the law, and were confined and tortured in military camps and federal prisons for their opinions. These men took the same position in regard to the Conscription Act that Theodore Parker took in regard to the Fugitive Slave Law—that the legislation was in violation of the higher law of God, and on this ground they refused to heed it.

(3) Lastly, it is right and proper to break the law when the law-breaker, moved by either one of these former principles, is not only willing, but glad to pay the penalty of his act in witness of the truth which he would serve. I always like to cite in this connection the noble case of my beloved friend, Roger Baldwin, who was a conscientious objector in the Great War. When Roger Baldwin was drafted under the Conscription Act he refused to report to a military camp and put on the uniform of the army. Instead of heeding the official summons under the law, Roger Baldwin reported to the Federal Court in this district, voluntarily surrendered himself to the custody of this court, and, pleading guilty to violation of the law, asked the judge to give him the full penalty of his offense. The judge, in answer to Mr. Baldwin's plea, and in fulfillment of his own duty, sentenced him to one year in prison. In serving this term, Roger Baldwin gave an obedience to the law not less exacting than that of conformity to its terms. For, after all, there are two ways in which we may obey a law. On the one hand we may do what the law tells us to do. On the other hand, unwilling to do this for conscientious reasons, we may accept voluntarily the penalties of the law for disobedience. In the latter case as in the former, we recognize the authority of government and pay reverence to its sovereignty.

These are the conditions under which alone it is right and proper to disobey the law. These conditions come rarely—once in a lifetime, perhaps. But occasionally they come in some one of those great crises of human destiny when vast moral issues are at stake and the destinies of human life are hanging in the balance. There are people who seem to feel that such a crisis is upon us today in the matter of the Prohibition laws. We find widespread disobedience to these laws. We hear shouts for liberty. We are told that patriots will soon be marching through the streets in rebellion against the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act. Are our "wet" friends justified in rising up in revolt against the Prohibition laws? Are we in the midst again of such a crisis as that which came in the days of the American Revolution or even of the movement on behalf of fugitive slaves? Do we see in the principles set forth above, in any one of the three conditions laid down, a justification of refusal to obey the law?

Take the first condition! Is the Eighteenth Amendment a despotic law imposed by an alien ruler in defiance of the will and in denial of the liberties of the people? I cannot so conceive it. The Eighteenth Amendment grew out of the very life of the people of this country through a period of more than three generations of public agitation and education. I can think of no law upon the statute books of this nation which is truer expression of the essential genius of our society as it has evolved during more than a century and a half of political existence. The Eighteenth Amendment came as the natural and inevitable result of a slowly developing movement, which reached therein its culmination in the thought and conscience of the American people. Furthermore, this Amendment was enacted by the due process of law established by our democratic government, and has been approved again and again by the Supreme Court as satisfying every condition of constitutional procedure. If this law is despotic, then so is every law as passed by the Congress of these United States. And again, this Amendment represents the convinced opinion of the great majority of the people of this country. Only a few days ago one of the wettest "wets" in New York stated publicly that he was willing to concede that in all probability not less than two-thirds of the people of this country are in favor of Prohibition. A two-thirds majority is a good working majority. I know of no democracy anywhere that asks a larger majority than this for the accomplishment of any legal purpose. If we don't like the Eighteenth Amendment, our duty is not to disobey it, but to repeal it. All the facilities of repeal are available at this moment, and must remain available at all times and under all conditions. If they are not used, it must be because they cannot be used successfully, and under such conditions it is not unfair to ask in a democracy that the law should be obeyed.

Does the Eighteenth Amendment conform to our second principle? Does this law violate any higher law of ethics or religion, or force any one of us to do something in violation of his conscience? On the contrary, the Eighteenth Amendment does not force any one to do anything. It simply requires what a thousand other laws require, that we shall refrain from doing what public opinion regards as dangerous to the health, happiness and safety of the community. It does not even abridge the liberty of the individual citizen, except as this liberty is abridged by every piece of social welfare legislation. The Prohibition law from this standpoint is in exactly the same class with the anti-narcotic law, the law prohibiting the white-slave traffic, the law prohibiting child labor. All these laws, like the Prohibition law, declare that certain things we shall not do, that the state may the more surely and more happily exist. What citizen worthy of a democracy refuses obedience to such a law?

Lastly our third condition! Where are the martyrs to the tyranny of the Prohibition law. Where

are the decent and reputable citizens who believe that the law should not be obeyed, and who are willing to stand up voluntarily and accept the penalty of their disobedience? I hear all around me of bootleggers and rum-runners, speak-easy proprietors and saloon-keepers, racketeers and other criminal gentry, who are being arrested and sent to prison. But in all the ten years of Prohibition, I have yet to hear of one high-class leader of public opinion who is willing to do in relation to the Eighteenth Amendment what Roger Baldwin did in relation to the Conscription Act—openly and deliberately break the law, and then march voluntarily into court and ask for punishment. If this is a fight for liberty, if this is a great popular revolution against tyranny, why should not the opponents of Prohibition be proud of their position? Why do they not violate the law openly, in places of public assembly, instead of behind closed curtains and drawn blinds, and by a hundred covert and surreptitious methods of concealment? So long as the present type of agitation goes on, I shall believe the worst and not the best of it. The test of any great crusade for justice and liberty is its capacity to produce martyrs. From the time of the first Christian to the time of the latest conscientious objector, this has been the proof of civic virtue. The failure of the anti-Prohibition movement to meet this test is the perfect proof of its dishonesty.

Presumption is all in favor of obedience to law as a condition of the survival of civilization. In any reservation upon this basic principle the burden of proof lies upon the man who would disobey the law. He who urges, condones or practices violation of law in a democracy must prove his case; and, in any case, takes upon himself a responsibility which may well make even the strongest and bravest among us to tremble. No braver man than Socrates ever lived, and yet, even when his own life was at stake, under the operation of a cruel and unjust law, he dared not assume this responsibility. The law had spoken, and he was ready to obey.

"I warn you," said this great Athenian to his disciple Crito, "whatever you plead against the law will be in vain." How eloquent the final colloquy between these two men!

"If you still hope," said Socrates, "speak."

"There is nothing that I can say, Socrates."

"Enough then, Crito. Let me proceed thus, for it is God who leadeth the way."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Future of India and World Peace

No one can definitely say what will be the future of a nation. But a student of history and international relations may make an approximate forecast of the possible trend of future developments in the course of events in a country; and I shall make an attempt to give my views on the future of India.

First of all, whoever wishes to understand the significance of the present Indian nationalist movement for Indian independence, must keep in mind that the people of India, long before the Christian era, developed their own culture and civilization. Long before the British attained their nationhood, city states (republican in form), large kingdoms and empires, flourished in India. The Indian Empire of Asoka the Great was larger than the area of the Indian Empire of today. In the field of pure and applied science, such as mathematics, physics, chemistry, engineering and medicine, the Indian people made very valuable contributions, as they did in the field of philosophy and religion. Thus it should be recognized that the Indian people have the potentialities for future greatness.

The second fact is that none should think that, because the Indian people, owing to peculiar circumstances and primarily to their own mistakes, were subjugated by an alien power, therefore they are incapable of governing themselves or freeing themselves from a foreign yoke. Many of the European peoples in the past were subject peoples, and after throwing off the yoke of their foreign rulers, they have become free and independent. It may be safely asserted that what has been possible for many nations in Europe, Asia and America to accomplish, can also in course of time be accomplished by the people of India.

For a living nation to recover its freedom, it is most important that it (at least an important section of it) should determinedly will and act to assert its national independence. Is there any indication of a growing determination on the part of the Indian people to be free from the oppressive British misrule? In answer to this question, no well-informed student of Indian affairs can ever deny that during the last few years the movement for Indian independence has gained tremendous momentum.

From my own personal experience I may say that in 1905 there was no powerful organized movement for Indian freedom. At that time the leaders of the Indian National Congress did not demand even the immediate grant of "dominion status." To be sure there were a few Indian nationalists who belonged to secret societies and tried to spread the ideal of national independence; but they did not have any considerable following. Until the last session of the All-India National Congress held at Lahore, many influential Indian nationalists—such as Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Moti Lal Nehru, and others—were opposed to the ideal of complete independence of India, or separation of India from the British Empire. However, it should be carefully noted that in this Lahore session of the All-India National Congress, held during the Christmas week of 1929, the Indian Independence Resolution was opposed by only six persons, while the other two thousand delegates solidly voted for it. Therefore it is evident that during the last twenty-five years the Indian nationalists' activities have brought about a tremendous revolution of national ideals in favor of independence.

In the past British officials and statesmen used to say that the Indian people are not able to govern themselves, and therefore they should not expect a "responsible government of the people." This was the view of no less a person than the late Lord Morley. But now

all the responsible British statesmen of all political parties agree that ultimately the British Government must confer "dominion status" upon India, otherwise they may lose India. Even British officials and British newspapers in India are practically unanimous in suggesting that the British authorities should in the near future call for a conference of those Indian moderates who will be satisfied with "dominion status" as the ultimate goal. Therefore the political future of India is either "dominion status" or absolute independence.

Indian moderates who belong to the Liberal Federation of India are in favor of "dominion status." The moderate Indian nationalists, such as Mahatma Gandhi, and others, have declared for Indian independence; but they have not altogether closed the door for an honorable adjustment of relations between Great Britain and India. But unless the British authorities agree to grant "dominion status" in the near future, the Liberal Federation of India will lose support of the majority of its present members who will join the All-India National Congress; and the control of the Congress will surely pass into the hands of the more extreme leaders such as Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, of Calcutta, and Mr. Stayamurti, of Madras.

Mahatma Gandhi has declared for Indian independence, but he advocates that this goal be attained through civil disobedience and non-violent non-co-operation. The young nationalists, under the leadership of Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose and others, assert that a mere declaration of independence is not sufficient. They advocate that the Indian Nationalists, in the foot-steps of the Irish Republicans, *organize the government of the Federated Republic of the United States of India, with its duly elected president and cabinet ministers.* They assert that the creed of non-violent non-co-operation may not win freedom for India and therefore they are prepared to adopt all legitimate means to recover their birth-right of national independence. They are already engaged in organizing an Indian National Militia, to undertake the necessary responsibilities of national defense and maintenance of internal peace. Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, in one of his recent declarations, has presented the following items of constructive work in Indian villages where the vast majority of the Indian people live:

(1) The village Congress Committee should organize a village militia, which will undertake the work of defense and will thereby make the villagers quite independent of police.

(2) The Congress Committee should urge upon the villagers to keep away from the British law-courts and settle their disputes by arbitration through the Congress Committees.

(3) The village Congress Committee should carry on an effective boycott of British goods and should at the same time promote *Swadeshi* (national) enterprise and help *Swadeshi* industries and thereby help the villagers to become economically self-reliant.

This is nothing but a program for creating a state within the state, from the very bottom, or the lowest, unit of government. Unless the British government grants "dominion status" in the near future, the advocates of the establishment of a "Federated Republic of the United States of India" will gain the upper hand in Indian politics; and they will not hesitate to face the issue, even through a revolution, as happened in the United States of America, and in Ireland.

Undoubtedly there are various obstacles in the way of achieving Indian independence—such as lack of complete unity among the various sections of the Indian people, and the reactionary attitude of the Indian Princes. But it may be observed that in the past, in all enslaved countries, factionalism and provincialism existed; and yet the advocates of freedom and national independence, although in the minority, ultimately overcame their oppressors and their allies. The same thing will happen in India, and the enemies of Indian freedom will be vanquished by the forces of Indian nationalist republicans.

British authorities fully realize that the attitude of the civilized world, especially that of the United States, towards the Indian struggle for independence will be a determining factor. Therefore they have started an international campaign to enlist world public opinion on their side against Indian aspirations. On the other hand, it may be sufficient to mention that free India will become a factor in favor of world peace and it will bring about a new balance of power in world politics, affording equal opportunity for trade and commerce for all nations in the vast market of a nation of 320,000,000 of people. Therefore Indian nationalists expect that many far-sighted statesmen of various countries will favor the cause of Indian freedom and the establishment of the Federated Republic of the United States of India.

TARAKNATH DAS.

New York City.

Tom Mooney

Noon, and a shameless deed
That was wrought in a mad unreason,
Crunch of the Iron Heel
And blare of a flaunting lie;
Noon, and a state's proud name
Write high on the roll of treason
To a Cause that shall never die.

Night, when a million prayers
From the throats of a million people,
Beat on the System's walls
With a wild, insistent cry;
Night, when a craven "NO!"
From the gilded State-House steeple
Wakes a wrath that shall never die

Till the martial Star of the Dawn
Shines red o'er a people risen,
Till a soul steps forth in the light
That was barred from the sun and sky;
Till the white-hot thunder of doom,
Has shattered the crumbling prison
Of a man that shall never die.

LILITH LORRAINE.

The Study Table

Gandhi's Ideas

It is always a joy to review a book* when it deals with an individual for whom one has both a high regard and a profound reverence. For me Gandhi is the greatest of living men. True, he has made no great discovery in the physical world; nor has he produced a great mechanical invention; but what he has done is to rediscover for this generation the reality of the spiritual world. The practicability of his methods may be open to criticism, as are those of every spiritual leader who deals with spiritual values; but no one can question the genuine spirituality of this great soul.

Books dealing with Gandhi are few. Perhaps this is due to the fact that we of the Occident find him an enigma, and are thus unable to interpret him. A few years ago Romain Rolland, the sensitive-souled Frenchman, gave us an interpretation which ranks among the really significant books. Since then Gandhi has written his autobiography, which appeared serially in UNITY, under the title, "My Experiments with Truth." Credit must be given to Dr. John Haynes Holmes for the American discovery of Gandhi. Then, too, year before last, Bishop Stanley Jones of the Methodist church, wrote a little book, which he called, "The Christ of the Indian Road," in which he presents Gandhi as the great spiritual leader of our time.

Irreparable harm has been done to our understanding of India by Katherine Mayo's book, "Mother India." A trip through the sewers and slums of America, England or Italy would reveal as much that is not the best in any of these countries. Perhaps the best book setting forth the Indian situation is J. T. Sunderland's "India in Bondage." That this book has merit is evidenced by the fact that when it appeared in India the British government arrested the publisher and confiscated the entire stock. Its almost instant republication in America shows how futile is the ignorant policy of suppression.

Now for Andrews's book! It is an attempt to tell the English speaking world what the secret of Gandhi's power is. As such it is a kind of commentary, explaining the convictions, points of view, methods and spiritual power of this strange man.

In a most fascinating style, and with sympathetic understanding, he tells us what Gandhi means by his championing of India's age-old custom of cow worship, that it is a reverence for the basic source of sustenance, Hindus being vegetarians. He also sets forth why Gandhi is attempting to place the spinning wheel again in every home—which is to augment the very meager income of the average family. The matter of untouchability is considered in the most common sense light, showing that Gandhi wants to continue the caste system as a classification of labor and profession, rather than a stratification, as it is now. He considers Gandhi's demand for complete national independence as over against home rule, which was promised India at the beginning of the World War.

Moreover, he interprets the sacred books of India, the Vedas, the Upanishad and the Purenas; while at the same time he sets forth the reasons why there exists a clash between the Muhammadans, who are meat eaters, and the Hindus, who are not. Then, too, he discusses the caste system, its origin, purpose and present day value, together with the four religious stages that constitute the objective of Hinduism.

But best of all, most of the material in the book is set forth in Gandhi's own words as they were expressed to Mr. Andrews in conversation, letter or conference. Out of the fifteen years of intimate contact of the author with Gandhi, something of the "feel" of this great soul has become more real than life itself.

The most valuable contribution of the book is its analysis of "Truth-force or Soul-force" upon which Gandhi relies in his non-violent methods of arousing his fellows. Here in this land of more than 300,000,000 people is a man who has more devoted followers than any one man ever had. His appeal is not to violence, bloodshed or destruction, but to patience and reliance upon the integrity of truth and spiritual power. Knowing that the Truth shall make men free.

There is a sign in the sky that far-reaching irretrievable events in the matter of relations between the East and West are under way in India. If a reenactment of the infamous Rowlett Bills, and a recurrence of the Amritsar massacre follows, as portents seem to indicate, then indeed we have the much feared breach between the Orient and Occident, which may eventuate with Russia, China and India, three-fourths of the world's population, definitely arrayed against the other fourth—the Occident.

This book ought to be read by all who wish to know "the tide in the affairs of men." It may be that history will repeat itself, and Pilate shall once more give his consent to crucify the spiritual one. If so, then as of old, "truth crushed to earth will rise again," more powerfully and more commandingly—"for love is the world's true revolution."

W. W. W. ARGOW.

*"Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas," by C. F. Andrews. Published by the Macmillan Company. $3.

In Defense of Democracy*

In this work by the venerable though misnamed "gloomy" dean of St. Paul's, the Rev. William Ralph Inge, are numerous prognostications, including a brilliant chapter on the failure of democracy. He says that "Democracy in America means anything or nothing at all, which makes it an excellent slogan." Again he says that "Democracy is in the curious position of having no friends, though we all did lip-service to it when we wanted to bring the Americans into the war." Then the witty paradoxical, and sometimes irritating Dean adds, "One of the advantages of democracy is that it is so unworkable that it covers a whole system of shams, some of which are tolerably serviceable." And, finally, he quotes, apparently with approval, the saying of an American that "Those who shout Abraham Lincoln's claptrap about government of the people, by the people, and for the people usually want to live on the people, by the people, and for themselves."

If the Dean were alone in his cavalier sallies on the forces of democracy we could dismiss the mat-

*"Labels and Libels," Dean Inge. Published by Harpers, New York.

ter with little ado. But there are many others who have spoken in like manner. Von Sybel declared that universal suffrage heralds the end of popular government; Tocqueville regarded successful democracies as smoothing the way for the next despotism; Mallock set definite limits to the functioning of pure democracy; and Nietzsche regarded democracy as one of the world's greatest sins.

Even the utterances of these prophets of impending calamity to unsuspecting democracy, might be dismissed as vaporous pronouncements of unsocial souls but for the fact that democracy is not only challenged but flippantly tossed aside by three major schools of political thought, namely, the aristocratic, the dictatorial, and the proletarian.

The aristocratic tradition takes the obvious fact that all people are not equal in stature or mentality and from this premise draws the absurd and unfounded conclusion that ability flows through the channels of a limited number of families. Despite the supposedly superior mentality of the aristocratic school they fail to note the fact that Jesus came from the household of a Nazareth carpenter, Lincoln from a Kentucky cabin, and that Gandhi is twice removed from the Brahmins. And in the world of business, as is well known, the captains of industry usually spring from the ranks. It is likewise in ecclesiastical affairs, especially in the Catholic church. In fact, the chief people who now take seriously the old aristocratic theory of superplasmic succession are the aged remnants of a faded glory who use it as compensation for their present shortage of popular esteem.

But the dictatorial school presents a more serious situation. In Italy, Mussolini, himself from the ranks, seizes the reins of government and rides ruthlessly over the prostrate form of civil liberties. The black shirts swarm everywhere, pace the corridors of the trains, and are in general a threat to the freedom of Italians. But, to the short-sighted, Mussolini is an efficient man. Has he not put labor in its place? Has he not cleaned the streets and alleys? Is he not draining a lake to restore Calligia's Galleys? And is he not now rebuilding the famous Coliseum? What are human liberties, if radicals can be kept from the senate, intelligent thought from the press, and rubbish from the streets? I have been astonished at the Pullman smoking-room comments of American business men on the greatness of this man who tosses Italian liberties to the winds. (I am almost persuaded that all college students should be required to major in political science.) But we may feel fairly sure that in due time another Garibaldi will arise and that the tyrant will fall.

But the proletarian dictatorship is even more of a menace to democratic ideas. This is not to deny that the proletarian government in Russia did a good job in overthrowing the Czar and so bringing to an end one of the most disreputable of governments. Nor is it to deny the superiority of the proletarian dictatorship to that of the aristocratic.

However, I am not concerned with comparative dictatorships. I am concerned with self-government on the one hand, however inefficient, and on the other all dictatorships, however effective. Kings, Mussolinis, and proletarian councils may command and compel results of a temporary nature, but the only results that are spiritually and permanently worthwhile come from the volition of intelligent people expressing themselves through democratic channels.

It is not that there is any reduction of the number of democratic countries. Indeed the form of democracy is still quite the vogue in governmental circles. The last century has seen the birth of many a democracy. In fact, there has been so much homage paid to the form of democracy that the spirit has almost died, and when the spirit dies, the form soon decays. Our difficulties go deeper than the mere forms of government, and it is these difficulties that cause many thoughtful people to hesitate between what seems to them inefficient democracy on the one hand, and effective dictatorship on the other.

It is both honest and wise to admit our shortcomings. It is perfectly true that our great cities are horrid examples of bad government. Crime and politics walk hand in hand; that is when not engaged in manipulating machine guns and throwing bombs. Wholesale robbery in connection with public contracts is the order of the day; and citizens who protest are thought to be a little "queer" in the head.

Let it be admitted also that we are short in efficient government. Needed public improvements pass from committee to committee, from session to session, from government to government, and the public good is bartered for political advantage. And worse yet, while the greatest feature of democracy is its provision for orderly change by registering the public will through the ballot box and legislative hall, we fall into the essentially anti-democratic way of worshipping the past and repeating old slogans. To follow Jefferson and Lincoln in their advocacy of change in governmental forms and ideals is likely to land one in the list of "undesirable citizens," along with Jane Addams and a hundred more of the finest characters that America has ever produced!

Ideally, *democracy is the faith of those who believe that within the limit of natural possibilities, the fortunes of human society are in the hands of the people to be worked out cooperatively, in the light of growing ideals of individual integrity and social well being and by means of whatever techniques and powers are available.* Obviously democracy as thus defined is far from being generally understood, or appreciated, or administered. Our task, therefore, is to free democracy from its non-essentials and to develop techniques by means of which it can be realized in the social life of the world.

CURTIS W. REESE.

War Resistance

The author of this booklet* was a conscientious objector in England during the Great War. When he was thrust into prison for his refusal of war service, he seemed to be alone. But his soul dreamed of the day when everywhere there would be war resisters, a noble company to defy the governments of the world.

This dream has now come true. In Part II of his little book, Mr. Brown tells us of the War Resisters' International and its spread through many countries. In Part I he justifies the cause in a series of brief, incisive chapters. Mr. Brown has the spirit and fervor of an apostle, and his testimony reads like a gospel.

H.

*"Cutting Ice," by H. Runham Brown. Published by the War Resisters' International, Middlesex, England.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Report of

The Social Service Committee

to the

New York East Conference

1930

Adopted at Grace Church, Brooklyn, April 7, 1930

Creating a Social Consciousness Among Our People

As Christians we believe that our Master has entrusted to us the task of promoting God's kingdom "on earth, as it is in heaven." We interpret this to include an earthly social order in which all man's activities and relationships conform to the will and ideals that God has revealed in Jesus. His life and teachings convince us that human values are supreme, that brotherhood is the right relationship among men, that love should be their dominant motive, and that service—not profit—should be the driving-force of human life and activity.

Our denomination—together with others—has subscribed to a social creed and other pronouncements that relate Jesus' teachings to modern social conditions. We feel, however, that there is too often a discrepancy between the ideals our denomination expresses from time to time, and the actions and attitudes of individual Methodists. As a result, this problem confronts us: how can we create a social consciousness among our people?

To do this successfully, our ministers need always to keep in mind the fact that they labor not only to maintain churches, but to save individuals and to redeem society. That they may keep informed of social conditions and tendencies, we urge that they avail themselves of the many opportunities presented by such information agencies as the Federal Council of Churches and the Methodist Federation for Social Service. Such organizations provide valuable sources of information. The well-informed minister finds many ways to present and interpret the social gospel to his people. Labor Day, Armistice Day, Lincoln's Birthday and other special occasions give him an opportunity to apply the Christian ideal to industrial problems and to inter-racial and international relations. Some ministers have used their local community and church papers to direct attention to books, articles and official church utterances, to "white lists" and their significance, and to other matters pertaining to modern social problems.

Groups within the local church ought to be encouraged to a more active and intelligent interest in the social gospel. We are happy to note that Church School curricula pay increasing attention to the social implications of religion. This, in addition to the fact that many churches have organized classes to study and discuss the application of Christian ideals to social and industrial problems, has changed the social outlook of many Methodists, especially among the young. Forums and debates in which all sides of a given question are freely and fairly presented have achieved the same results among adults. Encouraged by their ministers, many laymen have caught a new social vision while attending such conferences as the one recently held in New York to discuss the Church's relation to the southern textile situation. Such activities ought to be continued, encouraged and multiplied.

To preach and study the Christian ethic is not enough; we must express it in intelligent action. Too often our churches, in such matters as employees' salaries, the investment of church funds, and in their building and repair projects fall far short of the highest Christian ideals. If all our ministers and officials would carefully consider the social significance of their churches' business and financial enterprises, much would be done toward creating the social consciousness our people ought to have.

There are many social projects in which a local church can engage; by so doing, it helps others and at the same time clarifies its own social ideals. Practical relief work, for instance, may be linked up with a study of underlying facts and causes in such matters as the China Relief Fund and the Southern Textile situation. Some of our churches have sponsored community social surveys, the actual work being done by professionally trained experts, while local church groups studied causes and ways to prevent as well as to relieve such community conditions as slums, poverty and unemployment. The local church can also promote direct human contacts between different or differing social classes. Reconciliation trips, joint-meetings with other races, classes and nationalities, and conferences between representatives of conflicting groups mitigate prejudices, and further sympathy, understanding and friendship. In doing thus the will of God, our people come to understand better the social implications of His doctrine.

Pronouncements

Conscience and Citizenship

The rejection of the application for United States citizenship of Dr. Douglas C. Macintosh, a professor in the Yale Divinity School, raises the question as to whether or not liberty of conscience can be regarded as of vital importance in an enlightened democratic government.

In rejecting the application of Professor Macintosh the District Judge said:

"It appearing that the said Petitioner, considering his allegiance to be first to the will of God, would not promise in advance to bear arms in defense of the United States under all circumstances, but only if he believed the war to be morally justified, it is decreed, that the Petitioner is not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and further decreed that said petition for citizenship is denied."

"The Macintosh case is but one of an increasing number of applications of both men and women rejected for similar reasons. This policy seems so unjust to the individual and so detrimental to the public welfare that it is cause for grave concern."[1]

We believe that we would be false to the spirit of the Master and to trust reposed in us as religious teachers if we were to allow religious liberty and freedom of conscience to be violated without protest.

We commend adherence to the principle of liberty of conscience. We believe that there are higher loyalties, such as to God and man, which may transcend a narrow nationalism in the conscience of the individual; and we regret that allegiance to these higher loyalties may make it impossible for one to become a citizen of the United States.

Militarism in Education

While the attention of ardent workers for peace is directed toward spectacular movements such as the London Naval Conference, subtle attempts to militarize our youth continue to increase the enrollment in the R. O. T. C. throughout the country. The enrollment in this student military organization was, in 1923, 92,851 and last year had reached the surprising total of 126,453. This is a dangerous problem which is frequently overlooked by peace advocates. Defeated last year, the advocates of military training have secured the approval of the Board of Superintendents of the New York Public Schools for asking the War Department for aid in formally establishing a military training unit at Jamaica High School. The Board of Education is now considering the proposal. The Committee on Militarism in Education needs the support of our ministers and churches in facing this and similar issues constantly raised by those who would cultivate military habits in our youth.

This problem is made more difficult by the recent approval by Congress of the largest sum ever appropriated in this country for subsidizing military training in schools and colleges.

Again we call attention to the action of our last General Conference in going on record against all military training in high schools and compulsory military training in colleges. We approve this position.

Public Ownership

Whereas, The supplying of electricity, gas, water, communication and transportation is a public service which by its very nature is of a monopolistic character; and,

Whereas, Private enterprise has been allowed to furnish them on the assumption that it could give better and more efficient results than public operation; and,

Whereas, This assumption has been challenged in municipalities where the operation of their own electric light plants has been able to give better service at lower costs;

Therefore, We recommend careful study of the question of public ownership and operation of such utilities.

Religion and Home Life

The church has recognized something of its responsibility for happy

[1] "Conscience and Citizenship," a statement by the Religious Society of Friends.

Christian home life by the "special advices" in our Discipline in respect to marriage and divorce. We inquire whether our Board of Education has complied with the request of the General Conference of 1928 "to prepare Courses of Study setting forth the practical and spiritual values of marriage; such courses to be designed for use among young people in all our Church schools, colleges, and universities." We assume that such courses, when prepared, will meet with the real needs of our young people, giving them such sex education as will lift the entire subject into the realm of spiritual values.

"It is the clear duty of the churches to offer to their young people an opportunity to consult some qualified adviser—the minister, perhaps, or a physician, the director of religious education, or other specialist—who, besides having a clear grasp of the fundamental principles of sex morality, would have also an appreciation of modern tendencies and would be in a position to offer rational advice."*

In the interest of morality and sound scientific knowledge we favor such changes of the law in the States of New York and Connecticut as will remove the existing restrictions upon the communication by physicians to their patients of important medical information on birth control.

We recommend that the State of New York enact legislation requiring that licenses to marry shall be issued only after public notice and the lapse of a reasonable period of time to be fixed by law.

The Russian Religious Situation

Jews, Catholics, and Protestants have joined in protesting against religious persecutions in Russia. We heartily sympathize with all victims of persecution for opinion's sake in Russia or elsewhere. However, because these protests have political influence, we urge that the following facts be kept in mind:

1. That Russia's anti-religious policy is a reaction against a church that historically has been connected with despotism and oppression.

2. That reports from Russia are conflicting and uncertain.

3. That reputed persecutions may have been for political as well as religious activities.

4. The possibility that religion is being used as a tool by those who oppose the Soviets on other than religious grounds.

5. That the kind of protests being made, with their possible political connotations, will intensify the Soviet's opposition to religion, and will promote an unfriendly, even militaristic spirit in Russia, and endanger world peace.

In view of these facts, we warn against those prejudices that prevent an understanding of the Soviets and their experiment, and an appreciation of its possible social values. We believe that true religion in Russia can be furthered best, not by threats, protests, or diplomatic pressure, but by our own increased endeavors to create a Christian social order in which justice and brotherhood are dominant.

*Note: Statement prepared for submission to its constituent bodies for consideration in the report of the Commission of the Church and Social Service of the Federal Council of the Churches.

Stock Market Speculation

The Wall Street crash of 1929 opened our eyes to the fact that America had developed a speculation mania, as was evidenced by the estimate that eighty-five to ninety per cent of the buyers of stock were speculators rather than investors. Moreover, this speculation mania is a symptom of something a great deal deeper; it reveals a civilization mad for unearned profits and divested of spiritual ideals to make room for greed and lust for power. Innumerable remedies such as the outlawry of marginal buying and the curtailing of easy credit, have been suggested. But all such regulations are merely palliatives. We, however, are of the conviction that nothing less than a complete change in our national mood and temper can save us from a repetition of Wall Street's last October.

We therefore urge a comprehensive and a persistent program of social education in our churches which will establish ideals other than those of quick profits, and which will reveal especially to our young people the unethical character of our profit-mad civilization, to the end that they will be encouraged to lend themselves to the task of establishing a civilization in which human needs will supplant human greed.

Unemployment

The problem of unemployment imposes upon the Christian Church one of its most imperative social obligations. The solution is not confined to a program of definite activities in relief of those who are for the time being out of work or even in activities which seek positions for them—necessary as these are. Fundamentally, of course, the solution is in an economic readjustment which sets up hours of labor and compensation schedules which will be adequate for a comfortable support of the workers the year round and throughout the whole period of competency. Wherever this principle is recognized and accepted by employers and employees, remedies are devised such as unemployment insurance, savings plans and retirement pensions. The whole problem is so basic in human welfare that it involves the closest cooperation between all the organized forces related thereto such as state and municipal authorities, trade unions, and employers' organizations. The moral obligation involved is to bring about such a division of the proceeds of industry between workers and producers on the one hand and management and capital on the other, as shall be fair and adequate for both. Only a widespread acceptance of Christian principles can inspire a sufficient motivation for this ideal.

The Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Chateau de Bures
par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise
17 Miles from Paris, France
Country Boarding School
To Prepare Boys for American Colleges
30 Acres Own Farm
New Dormitories With Outdoor Sleeping Porches
Gymnasium. Athletic Fields
Modern, Progressive Methods
Music, Art, Sciences
English, French, and American Masters
For information address
Edwin Cornell Zavitz, Headmaster
Chateau de Bures, par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise, France

MAY
Is the month for the year's greatest cleaning. The home's cold weather drapes and rugs, blankets and comforters, heavy motor robes, should all be cleansed before putting them away. Summer cretonnes and slip covers should be made ready for service. Send work here in confidence of its being done by the latest equipment and methods.
Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue